Name	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7
County WG	Davis	Davis	Davis	Davis	Davis	Davis	Davis
Did the Round 1 workgroup meetings (August-September) provide adequate information to prepare you for your involvement in the process?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
What critical information (if any) was missing from the R1 workgroup presentations?	anthing to do with technical questions or answers. The meeting was conducted to have a pre disposed outcome.					Aircraft and Locomotive contribution to PM 2.5 and potential scheduling options. Wood burning, coal, and fireworks contribution and regulation.	would have been nice to have more data specific to Davis county
Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
[Comment] Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	Typically when asking stakeholders to become involved it is meant that they have a stake. This meeting was just as the question is worded. Presenters. not moderators. or anything else that would induce involvement or clarification.	What are the limiting factors for PM2.5 development from Ammonia? If ammonia is reduced, will it result in a reduction of PM2.5, or will it be more effective to reduce NOx?					
Have you already developed your constituent group?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
[Number of Constituent] How many constituents have you involved?	10	8	10	5	10	10	10
[Number of Meetings] How many times have you met with these constituents as a group?	2	1	5	2	2	5	2
[Informed on PM2.5 issues] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	1	2	5	5	2	5	4
[Technical expertise] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	2	1	5	5	3	5	5
[Understanding of process] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	1	4	5	5	2	5	4
[Rank 1] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)		Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest
[Rank 2] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed using DAQ website or publications		Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed using DAQ website or publications
[Rank 3] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Other		Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Other	Informed by media	Informed by media
[Rank 4] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by personal or professional interest		Other	Informed by media	Informed by media	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)

Name	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7
[Rank 5] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by media		Informed by media	Other	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Other	Other
Do you have any other comments or thoughts about the constituent-based approach being used in this process?	I think this is very appropriate	See comment above.	No			I'd like to know how the specific stakeholder groups were selected.	no
[Rank 1] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Point	Mobile	Mobile	Area	Mobile	Mobile	Mobile
[Rank 2] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Area	Point	Area	Mobile	Area	Point	Area
[Rank 3] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Mobile	Area	Point	Point	Point	Area	Point
Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
[Comment] Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.		So far, I have only met with one of 5 groups that I have scheduled to meet with. My answers to this survey would be more meaningful if I could to it the middle of November.	At the direction of the DEQ, the group focussed on strategies for which we had specific expertise, even though these did not represent the most effective strategies.			My group has been working on this issue for some time and has considerable professional expertise	
[Area] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	60+ min	30 - 60 min	60+ min	30 - 60 min	0 - 30 min	60+ min	0 - 30 min
[Mobile] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	60+ min	30 - 60 min	0 - 30 min	60+ min	30 - 60 min
[Point] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	60+ min	30 - 60 min	0 - 30 min	60+ min	0 - 30 min
Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Name	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7
[Comment] Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.			Several emission strategies for the oil refining industry have been initiated through other processes, and are at various stages of implementation. However, based on the information presented by the DAQ, these will have minimal to negligible impact on the problems. The constituents of this group are also aware of several reduction strategies for other sectors, but had less technical expertise on some of those.			We've been working on this for several years	
[Rank 1] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Other	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	Independent research	Independent research	Independent research
[Rank 2] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Independent research	Independent research	Informed by personal or professional interest	EPA list provided to workgroups	EPA list provided to workgroups
[Rank 3] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Other	Informed using DAQ website or publications	EPA list provided to workgroups	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed using DAQ website or publications
[Rank 4] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			EPA list provided to workgroups	EPA list provided to workgroups	Other	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest
[Rank 5] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?			Informed using DAQ website or publications	Other	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Other	Other
What was the group's number 1 ranked emission reduction strategy?	we are still in this process. this has not been completed yet.	Reduce crude protein in livestock feed.	Cooling tower return line VOC monitoring and repair	Cooling tower return line VOC monitoring and repair	Telecommute on Red Days/Air Action Days	Adopt California standards on diesel emissions and fuel economy	Tele-work on PM 2.5 action
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	3	3	4	4	4
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	3	3	4	5	4
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	4	4	4	4	4
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	4	4	4	4	4

Name	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			1	1	4	5	4
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			4	3	4	5	4
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 1 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4	5	4	4	5	4
What was the group's number 2 ranked emission reduction strategy?		Treat manure with supplement to reduce pH.	Lower LDAR leak definitions	Lower LDAR leak definitions.	Manure Management Rules	Strict no idling ordinances throughout the entire affected area	Truck Stop Electrification
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	4	4	2	5	5
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	3	3	3	5	3
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	4	4	2	5	4
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	4	4	3	4	4
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			1	1	5	5	5
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			3	3	5	5	3
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 2 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)		4	5	3	4	4	4
What was the group's number 3 ranked emission reduction strategy?			VOC control on tank degassing for maintenance.	VOC control on tank degassing for maintenance	Mass Transit Frontrunner - Bus Rapid Transit Connections	Reduce freeway speed limits to 55 mph	Mass transit Frontrunner-Bus Rapid Transit Connections

Name	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			3	3	3	5	3
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			3	3	3	5	3
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	4	4	5	3
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	4	3	3	4
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			1	1	3	5	4
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			5	4	3	5	3
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 3 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)			5	3	4	5	3
What was the group's number 4 ranked emission reduction strategy?			Vapor control at service stations	Trip reduction plans for major employers	Truck Stop Electrification	Free use of UTA during winter inversion season Nov. 15-Mar 15, paid for by state general fund or partial diversion of gas tax	Anti Idling Programs with inforcment
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			2	3	3	5	4
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			5	4	4	5	4
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	4	4	5	5

Name	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			3	4	4	5	
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			2	2	3	5	5
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			3	3	3	5	2
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 4 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)			5	3	4	5	4
What was the group's number 5 ranked emission reduction strategy?			Trip reduction plans for major employers.	Restriciton on volatility of solvents.	Anti-Idling Program w/ Compliance and Enforcement	Reduce emissions from point sources, especially the KUC Rio Tinto expansion and refineries (breakdown and start-up)	Commercial cooking exaust
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			3	3	4	4	
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	2	4	5	
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	3	5	5	
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)			4	4	2	3	
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			2	3	3	5	3
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)			3	5	3	5	3

Name	Participant 1	Participant 2	Participant 3	Participant 4	Participant 5	Participant 6	Participant 7
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 5 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)			5	3	4	5	3
What time of day is best to meet?	Afternoon	Either	Morning	Either	Either	Afternoon	Morning
Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
[Comment] Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.		Meet only as long as needed.					As long as it is well planned out
Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
[Comment] Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?	we are still working on proper formulas and appropriate figures for the Graphic Arts and the VOC's associated with them.	We need more time before the survey to schedule constituent meetings.					

Name	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
County WG	Davis	Davis	Davis	Davis	Davis	Davis
Did the Round 1 workgroup meetings (August-September) provide adequate information to prepare you for your involvement in the process?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
What critical information (if any) was missing from the R1 workgroup presentations?		Needed more discussion on possible solutions with their costs and benefits.	Nothing that comes to mind was mission			From a laymans perspective it was challenging to digest the material adequately enough to have a discussion with many of the individuals and companies in my area of interest.
Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	No	No	No	No	No	
[Comment] Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.						
Have you already developed your constituent group?	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
[Number of Constituent] How many constituents have you involved?	6	7		10		4
[Number of Meetings] How many times have you met with these constituents as a group?	2	1		5		2
[Informed on PM2.5 issues] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	4	1		5		4
[Technical expertise] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5	2		5		4
[Understanding of process] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	4	3		5		2
[Rank 1] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)		Informed by personal or professional interest		Informed by personal or professional interest
[Rank 2] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed using DAQ website or publications		Informed using DAQ website or publications		Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)
[Rank 3] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by media	Informed by personal or professional interest		Informed by media		Informed by media
[Rank 4] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed by media		Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)		Informed using DAQ website or publications

Name	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[Rank 5] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Other	Other		Other		Other
Do you have any other comments or thoughts about the constituent-based approach being used in this process?		There was frustration that web site data was not more understandable				my constituent base is very diverse nad it is difficult to develop common interests and interactive brainstorming
[Rank 1] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Mobile	Area		Mobile	Mobile	Area
[Rank 2] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Area	Mobile		Area		Mobile
[Rank 3] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Point	Point		Point		Point
Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.	Yes	Yes		No		Yes
[Comment] Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.						They understood the difference in sources but not what was measured within the sources. i.e. solvents as a point source
[Area] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	30 - 60 min		0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min
[Mobile] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min
[Point] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min
Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.	Yes	No		Yes		Yes

Name	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[Comment] Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.						Both mechanical, (stack scrubbers, NGV, etc. and changes in fuel sources such as CNG
[Rank 1] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest		Informed by personal or professional interest		Informed by personal or professional interest
[Rank 2] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Independent research	Informed using DAQ website or publications		Independent research		Independent research
[Rank 3] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Informed using DAQ website or publications	EPA list provided to workgroups		Informed using DAQ website or publications		EPA list provided to workgroups
[Rank 4] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	EPA list provided to workgroups	Independent research		EPA list provided to workgroups		Informed using DAQ website or publications
[Rank 5] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Other	Other		Other		Other
What was the group's number 1 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Continuing and improving automobile emission testing.	More strictly enforcing current laws such as no burning wood on red days.		Better transportation planning		CNG incentives
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4			4		5
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4	4		5		5
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4	5		4		4
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	3		3		3

Name	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	4	2		4		4
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3	2		3		2
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 1 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	4	5		4		4
What was the group's number 2 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Improved source monitoring and enforcement.	Free or reduced fare for mass transit on inversion days				Alternative Energy
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	3				2
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	5				3
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	5				2
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	3				1
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3	2				3
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3	1				3
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 2 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3	4				3
What was the group's number 3 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Mandatory shutting down of business operations and driving during poor air quality episodes.	Public education campaign to educate businesses and citizens on ways to reduce pm2.5 during inversion days.				

Name	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2	4				
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	5				
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2	5				
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	1	5				
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	4	2				
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5	2				
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 3 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	2	5				
What was the group's number 4 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Provide useful education that people understand and know the issues and what they can/should realistically do to help the situation.	Statewide mobilization on inversion days to publicize and address problem				
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5	3				
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	4				
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	4				

Name	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	4				
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	2	2				
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3	2				
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 4 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	2	5				
What was the group's number 5 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Continually create and improve travel options including UTA trains, busses, cleaner cars, bike lanes. Make these easily available to public.	Tax incentives and fee assessments to create incentives for cleaner VOC producing processes				
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	3				
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4	3				
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	3				
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	2				
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	2	2				
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3	3				

Name	Participant 8	Participant 9	Participant 10	Participant 11	Participant 12	Participant 13
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 5 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	2	5				
What time of day is best to meet?	Either	Either			Either	Morning
Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
[Comment] Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.		Depending on the content				
Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?	No	No		No		No
[Comment] Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?						